

The University of Chicago

A PRE-ACHAEMENID HISTORY
OF PERSIA: THE LAND
AND ITS PEOPLE

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED
TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF
THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES
AND LITERATURES

1932

By

GEORGE GLENN CAMERON

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
HISTORY OF IRAN
The University of Chicago Press, 1936

The University of Chicago

A PRE-ACHAEMENID HISTORY
OF PERSIA: THE LAND
AND ITS PEOPLE

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED
TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF
THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES

AND LITERATURES

1932

By

GEORGE GLENN CAMERON

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
HISTORY OF IRAN
The University of Chicago Press, 1936

COPYRIGHT 1936 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PUBLISHED MARCH 1936

COMPOSED AND PRINTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.



CHAPTER I

THE LAND AND ITS PEOPLE

IRAN, a plateau with numerous large depressions, is cradled between two mountain ranges sweeping majestically from the knotted heights of Armenia north of the Fertile Crescent. One wing, a lofty ridge known as the Elburz, advances eastward along the south of the Caspian, where it reaches its climax in the towering peak of the Demavend. Continuing eastward, it dwindles away in the steppes of Khurasan, where it meets the line of the Hindu Kush coming from the opposite direction, from the Pamirs, the "roof of the world." The second wing, called the Zagros ranges, curves gently southeastward, then still more south. In numerous parallel folds it skirts the eastern edge of fertile Babylonia, forms a glittering and almost impassable barrier on the eastern shore of the Persian Gulf, and, after advancing over the desolate regions along the Indian Ocean, turns sharply northward through Baluchistan and Afghanistan to join other mountains spreading, like the Hindu Kush, fanlike from the Pamirs.

These mountain ranges on either side of the plateau have been from time immemorial Iran's strength—and weakness. From them came treasured metals and

stones, gold and silver, lead and copper, lapis lazuli and carnelian. From them also, thrust up in the wake of the volcanic activity of late Pliocene times, came diorite and obsidian, both highly prized in antiquity. Finally, the rivers of Iran, racing swiftly through tremendous defiles from the heights to level land, brought fertility to many thousand square miles of barren soil, and desolation to other thousands. Silt carried by these streams during the glacial or pluvial periods was deposited in an inner basin and covered with water which evaporated as the winds swept together the sandy gravel. Thus, what was once a mighty sea became only sandy wastes and salt deserts. By far the greater portion of Iran is desert throughout the year, while, as summer advances, large tracts which in the spring were green are burned up and the whole plateau becomes dry and parched.

Judged on this basis, the land might truly be thought forbidding and uninviting to foreigners. Nevertheless, it is the connecting link between the Far East and the Near East. Migratory movements and warriors' campaigns have frequently swept across its borders in historic times, and these surely began in the dark past of prehistory. Consequently, the routes which lead without great difficulty into the land are worthy of special consideration.

Two passes across the Caucasus lead through Armenia into Anatolia, but a third permits entry to the coastal region south of the Caspian or to the

mountain valleys of the Zagros. This was the route followed, for example, by some of the Scythians in the seventh century before our era, when they penetrated into Media and Persia and for a time threatened to upset the political arrangement of Western Asia.

On the part of the dwellers in Mesopotamia, there was a constant need to hold in check the highlanders from the Zagros Mountains and the Iranian plateau and to maintain an open trade route with the east. Accordingly, warriors of the lowlands succeeded from time to time in following a few of the arduous paths across the Zagros; then as now, however, for conquest or for commerce, the most frequently traveled route was the Baghdad-Kirmanshah-Hamadan trail. It seemed an irony of fate that this path, favored by the Assyrians, was used by their enemies, the Medes, when they descended from the highlands and subdued the worshipers of Ashur.

On the northeastern frontier, in spite of numerous parallel mountain ranges, entrance to Iran is comparatively unobstructed. Across this frontier, to and from Turkestan and Central Asia, roamed Moustertian man; and the Indo-Iranian peoples who swarmed over it in the second millennium B.C. ultimately brought into being the first of the Indo-Iranian empires, namely, the kingdoms of the Medes and the Persians. In contrast with this frontier the eastern and southeastern borders are almost im-

passable; yet cultural relationships between Iran and India even in prehistoric times can be pointed out, and Darius the Persian controlled the Indus Valley and the Punjab for a time.

The southern border of Iran faces so abruptly on the Indian Ocean that inhabitants of this region are denied the enjoyment of maritime pursuits. Northwest of this district the mountain ranges which are a continuation of the Zagros chain trend with remarkable regularity from northwest to southeast. These ranges are separated by regular valleys and intersected by enormous defiles, so that passage is difficult and commerce seriously impaired.

One district alone in this region gave easy access to the plateau of Iran itself, to the Persian Gulf, and to the fertile and early civilized Babylonia. This district, the plain of Susa, geographically bade fair to be called a part of Babylonia. However, an encircling arm of the Zagros, added to the marshes which in early days surrounded the head of the Persian Gulf, protected this level basin. In the north and northeast other snow-topped ranges of the Zagros furnished abundant water for several rivers which irrigated the land. Two of these approach each other at right angles in the center of the plain. When but a few miles apart they again recede, the Karkhah turning southwest toward Babylonia, the river Diz flowing southeast into a third river, the Karun. At the point where the Karkhah and Diz most nearly ap-

proach, there grew up in antiquity a city to be famous in Babylonian as in Elamite and Iranian history—Susa. This city, today but a “tell,” still speaks eloquently of its one-time grandeur. It measures almost 3,000 feet on a side, and its highest point is well over 120 feet above the surrounding plain. Since the winter of 1897 the Ministère de l'instruction publique et des beaux-arts, by authority of the French government, has excavated at this site; and each year has seen some striking revelation of the history of the ancient Orient or some beautiful addition to the magnificent collection in the Louvre. Though much still remains to be excavated, we must emphasize the fact that Susa alone, in her fertile lowland, can never reveal the deeper secrets of Elamite history. For the Elamites were primarily highlanders, and during many periods of their history Susa played but a minor part, while a leading character in the drama was Anshan, not yet certainly located. Doubtless one reason for this relative political unimportance was the climate of the Susa basin. During nine months of the year the whole plain is burned up by the sun's heat, whose intensity affords some credence to Strabo's tale that lizards and serpents could not crawl across the streets at midday without being burned. Susa must nevertheless provide most of our available material for a political history of early Iran, since no other Elamite site has been excavated.

Iran, as thus described, gave little geographical

promise of great things to come in history. It was far more suited to "food-gatherers" than to "food-producers," for it was a land adapted to the grazing of animals rather than to the tilling of the soil. Nevertheless, its influence goes back to prehistory, and this influence demands present consideration.

Flint implements of Middle Paleolithic types have been found in central Iran, northeast of modern Shiraz, near the shores of what may have been a large sweet-water lake in those times. It has been suggested that Paleolithic man passed through the valleys of southern Iran in a general northwesterly direction and entered Kurdistan through the gorges at Sulaimaniyah, Rowandiz, and points north.¹ Artifacts of Mousterian man, very similar to others discovered in Palestine, have been found in caves near Sulaimaniyah.² Although the evidence is incomplete, it is sufficient to suggest that occupation of the caves was contemporaneous with the last glacial advance. It can be only an accident that other Mousterian implements have not been reported from diverse sites in Iran, for they have been discovered throughout all Europe in the west, through Africa, Palestine, India, even to Manchuria. Aurignacian man, successor to the declining Mousterian, seems also to have found a home in the Zagros, as he did in other parts of the

¹ Henry Field in *AJSL*, LI (1934/35), 208 f.

² D. A. E. Garrod, "The Palaeolithic of Southern Kurdistan," *Bulletin of the American School of Prehistoric Research*, No. 6 (March, 1930).

ancient Orient. There is no evidence, however, for other types of flints of Paleolithic manufacture.

It is possible that Iran passed through the Neolithic stage of development, although it is not until the very latest subperiod, the so-called "Chalcolithic," when copper was being introduced for ornaments, that we can obtain clarity of vision. Professor Herzfeld recently announced the discovery of a village near Persepolis which must be assigned to this stage of man's development.³ The village, with its single-story mud-brick dwellings on either side of a narrow street, remains today almost as early Chalcolithic man left it millenniums ago. His stone implements and stone bowls are a lasting memento of his life at this site; and his wheelmade pottery, carefully fashioned and magnificently painted, is a permanent tribute to his craftsmanship. Two ornaments of copper, presumably hammered, are trifles among the thousands of stone objects; but they show that this man lived at the very dawn of the Metal Age.

While Europe was still in the later stages of Paleolithic culture, Iran, like the rest of the Near East, advanced rapidly into the Copper Age. Man, having made the acquaintance of metals, used them freely in his everyday life, although stone implements were still widely employed. At the same time he began to domesticate plants and animals. At Jemdet Nasr in

³ E. Herzfeld in the *Illustrated London News*, May 25, 1929, pp. 892 f., and *Iranische Denkmäler*, Lfgn. 1 and 2 (Berlin, 1932), pp. 3-18, Pls. 1-30.

Babylonia the excavators found kernels of true wheat and six-rowed barley,⁴ a discovery equaling that of wheat and barley chaff in the lowest stratum of Anau, just beyond the northeastern border of Iran in Russian Turkestan.⁵ Wild emmer, long considered the ancestor of cultivated wheat, has been revealed near the city of Karind on the Baghdad-Kirmanshah road in the Zagros Mountains.⁶ Sheep and long-horned cattle are portrayed on sherds of painted pottery from every section of Iran. This ware, the most notable contribution of Copper Age man, was a direct descendant of the Iranian early Chalcolithic painted pottery. It appears at Susa, where it is known as Susa I,⁷ and, in successively later developments, at Nihavend⁸ and Kirmanshah⁹ in the Zagros; at Bushire in the south;¹⁰ near the cities of Teheran,¹¹

⁴ H. Field in the *American Anthropologist*, XXXIV (1932), 303-9.

⁵ Pumpelly, *Explorations in Turkestan, Expedition of 1904* (Washington, D.C., 1908), pp. 38 f., 67, and 72; cf. Schellenberg, *ibid.*, pp. 469-73.

⁶ A. Schulz in *Berichte der deutschen botanischen Gesellschaft*, XXXI (1913), 226-30, and *Die Geschichte der kultivierten Getreide* (Halle, 1913), pp. 13 f.

⁷ De Morgan, *Mém.*, I, 184-88; De Morgan, Pottier, and De Mecquenem, *Mém.*, Vol. XIII.

⁸ Herzfeld in the *Illustrated London News*, June 1, 1929, pp. 942-45; *AMI*, I (1929-30), 65-71; *Iranische Denkmäler*, Lfg. 3/4 (Berlin, 1933), pp. 19-26, Pls. 1-27. See also Contenau and Ghirshman in *Syria*, XIV (1933), 1-11.

⁹ De Mecquenem, *Mém.*, XX, 126 f.

¹⁰ Pézard, *Mém.*, XV, 13-19.

¹¹ De Mecquenem, *Mém.*, XX, 115-25.

Shiraz,¹² and Kashan¹³ in the central part of the plateau; and in Seistan¹⁴ and Baluchistan¹⁵ in the east.

All the available evidence indicates that the painted-pottery culture persisted steadfastly within Iran while Mesopotamia was undergoing a gradual and distinct evolution. Susa alone on the border of the plateau felt the impact of the development on the west, and recent excavations have revealed the presence at this site of the typically Mesopotamian wares. Thus superimposed upon the pottery of Susa I are sherds which belong to the earliest period of Mesopotamian archeology, namely, the al-^cUbaid period; and above these again are fragments which can be assigned in turn to the Uruk and to the Jemdet Nasr periods.¹⁶ One group of pottery vases does not, however, belong with the Mesopotamian objects but has its closest parallels in far-off Seistan and Baluchistan.¹⁷ This is the generally monochrome

¹² H. Field in *AJSL*, LI (1934/35), 208.

¹³ A. U. Pope in the *Illustrated London News*, December 15, 1934, p. 1005; R. Ghirshman, *ibid.*, March 16, 1935, pp. 416 f.

¹⁴ Aurel Stein, *An Archaeological Tour in Gedrosia*, "Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India," No. 43 (Calcutta, 1931); *Innermost Asia* (Oxford, 1928), II, 949-58, and Vol. III, Pls. 113 f.; "The Indo-Iranian Borderlands" (Huxley Memorial Lecture for 1934), *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, LXIV (1934), 179-202.

¹⁵ Aurel Stein, *An Archaeological Tour in Waziristān and Northern Balūchistān*, "Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India," No. 37 (Calcutta, 1929).

¹⁶ De Mecquenem, *Mém.*, XX, 99-112 and 128-32.

¹⁷ With some of the pottery published by Aurel Stein in "Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India," Nos. 37 and 43.

pottery known as Susa II; although it may be contemporary with Jemdet Nasr wares, its occurrence has unfortunately never been stratigraphically determined. It has recently been suggested that Susa II represents an intrusion of a peculiar phase of the late Iranian painted-pottery culture,¹⁸ but nothing definite can be asserted at present.

We are doubly unfortunate in lacking a precise dating for the ware, since the earliest writing on clay tablets in Elam was contemporary with its manufacture.¹⁹ In Mesopotamia clay tablets have been discovered in strata which belong to the Uruk period;²⁰ by the Jemdet Nasr period tablets with pictographic inscriptions show words and names that are indubitably Sumerian. The signs are no longer linear; and the primary numerical system, perhaps of these texts and certainly of the Sumerian, is sexagesimal.²¹ Our Susa documents,²² as well as those from central Iran,²³

¹⁸ H. Frankfort, *Archeology and the Sumerian Problem* (SAOC, No. 4 [1932]), pp. 65-72.

¹⁹ De Mecquenem, *Mém.*, XXV, 189-91 and 205.

²⁰ See now A. Nöldeke, E. Heinrich, and E. Schott, "Fünfter vorläufiger Bericht über die von der Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft in Uruk unternommenen Ausgrabungen," *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1933, No. 5, esp. pp. 9 and 14.

²¹ Langdon, *Pictographic Inscriptions from Jemdet Nasr* ("Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts," Vol. VII [Oxford, 1928]); cf. Meissner in *AOF*, VI (1930-31), 303 f.

²² Scheil, *Mém.*, VI, 59 ff., and Vol. XVII.

²³ Ghirshman, "Une tablette proto-élamite du plateau iranien," *RA*, XXXI (1934), 115-19.

are written in what is commonly known as proto-Elamite and are comparable with those from Babylonia in shape only. The signs retain the linear design and are seemingly to be read as pure ideographs. The numerical system appears to be decimal.²⁴ A common origin for the two scripts is possible; nevertheless, it is also conceivable that proto-Elamite was independent. Eventually the inhabitants of Elam adopted the Sumerian script and employed it to write their own language. Period by period their signs followed those in current use in Babylonia; judged on this basis, an inscription from the island Bushire, known as Liyan (*li-ia-an*) to the Elamites, in the Persian Gulf shows that Sumerian script was already in use for Elamite at a period somewhat antecedent to that of Sargon of Agade and hints at a widespread culture, if not empire.²⁵ Thereafter, particularly in the twelfth century B.C., numerous inscriptions reveal the main essentials of the Elamite language.²⁶

To clarify these main essentials, and thereby to make possible a more accurate translation of the

²⁴ For discussions of the proto-Elamite texts see Scheil, *loc. cit.*; Weidner, *AOF*, III (1926), 84; Langdon in *JRAS*, 1925, pp. 169-73.

²⁵ François Lenormant, *Choix de textes cunéiformes* (Paris, 1873), p. 127, No. 41; cf. Hüsing, *Quellen*, No. 1.

²⁶ For discussions on Elamite phonetics and grammar see F. Bork, "Elam. B. Sprache," *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, III (1925), 70-83, with the bibliography there cited; R. Bleichsteiner, "Beiträge zur Kenntnis der elamischen Sprache," *Anthropos*, XXIII (1928), 167-98; Th. Kluge, "Das Elamische," *Le Muséon*, XLVI (1933), 111-56; Bork, "Elamische Studien," *MAOG*, VII, Heft 3 (1933), 3-31.

Elamite texts for historical purposes, the writer undertook some years ago the compilation of an Elamite dictionary. The facilities furnished by the great Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute were at his disposal; and his dictionary, since completed, in the manner of its Assyrian predecessor permits the examination and comparison of every word in the published Elamite inscriptions with full context. Without the revised translations made possible by the dictionary, this history could never have been prepared, nor would many important details of Elamite grammatical structure have become clear. Only the essential features of the Elamite language need, however, be indicated in this study.

In matters of phonology there is marked disagreement between the spoken word and the written script. The Elamites rarely made clear distinction in writing between voiced and voiceless consonants; their *b* and *p*, *d* and *t*, *g* and *k*, and *z* and *s* were seldom differentiated.²⁷ Individual vowels were frequently nasalized in the spoken language, but in the written word an overhanging *m*, *n*, or *ng* was often omitted. Further, the cuneiform script made no provision for a few of the sounds which could be heard in the spoken language; thus, for example, a sound variously heard as *t*, *l*, or *lt* led to diverse methods of spelling

²⁷ Thus arose such dual forms as *kudur* and *kutur* or *kutir*, as in *Kudur-Nahhunte*; *Lagamar* and *Lakamar*, the name of a deity; *Anzan* and *Anshan*, the name of a land. Throughout this work, attempt has been made to adhere to the Elamite usage customary in the period in question.

the native name for Elam, *Haltamti*, by the Elamites themselves.

As in English, the noun does not distinguish between masculine and feminine, though the difference between person and thing, as "king" and "kingdom," is usually marked. One remarkable characteristic of the language is a double genitive construction in which the suffix of a noun is repeated at the close of the genitival phrase, together with all its modifying elements. Thus such a phrase as "in the temple of Shimutta, the god of Elam," is expressed in this order: "temple, Shimutta, the god, Elam, of, of, in."

The verbal forms are by far the most troublesome elements. In addition to the fact that the root meaning of the verb has often been unknown, failure to identify a subordinate verb as such, even when the root meaning of the verb was clear, frequently has led students of the language to an impossible translation or to a hopeless *impasse*. Fortunately, the subordinate verb is, almost without exception, clearly recognizable; our main problem now is a more accurate definition of the meanings of the verbal roots.

Many of the elements characteristic of Elamite seem common to those of a linguistic group found today in the Caucasus area only and referred to as the "Caucasian" family of languages, although certain phonetic and grammatical parallels with the Tamil dialect of Dravidian in southern India have been noted.²⁸

²⁸ Cf. G. W. Brown, "The Possibility of a Connection between Mitanni and the Dravidian Languages," *JAOI*, L (1930), 273-305.

Many of these elements seem to have ancient counterparts in the languages spoken by the Kassites,²⁹ the Lullubi,³⁰ and the Gutî³¹ in the central Zagros; by the Haldians in the mountains of Armenia;³² by the Hurrians in the great bend of the Euphrates;³³ by a few peoples of Asia Minor, such as the Protohattians³⁴

²⁹ Friedrich Delitzsch, *Die Sprache der Kossäer* (Leipzig, 1884); T. G. Pinches, "The Language of the Kassites," *JRAS*, 1917, pp. 101-14.

³⁰ Cf. E. A. Speiser, *Mesopotamian Origins* (Philadelphia, 1930), pp. 88-96.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 96-119.

³² A. H. Sayce, "The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van, Deciphered and Translated," *JRAS*, 1882, pp. 377-732; Tseretheli, "Die neuen haldischen Inschriften König Sardurs von Urartu," *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Klasse, Vol. XVIII (1927/28), No. 5; J. Friedrich, "Beiträge zu Grammatik und Lexikon des Chaldischen," *Caucasica*, VII (1931), 53-86, and VIII (1931), 114-50; "Zur urartäischen Nominalflexion," *ZA*, XL (1931), 264-88; cf. also Th. Kluge, "Die Sprache der urartäischen Inschriften und ihre Stellung im kaukasischen Sprachenkreise," *MVAG*, XII, Heft 5 (1907), 176-224.

³³ L. Messerschmidt, "Mitanni-Studien," *MVAG*, IV, Heft 4 (1899), 175-308; Bork, "Die Mitannisprache," *MVAG*, XIV, Heft 1/2 (1909), 1-126; A. Gustavs, "Verbindungs-Linien zwischen dem Mitannischen, dem Elamischen, und dem Lykischen," *Memnon*, VII (1915), 228-32; A. Gustavs, "Mitanni. B. Sprache," *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, VIII (1926), 218-26; E. Forrer, "Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hatti-Reiches," *ZDMG*, LXXVI (1922), 224-28; Bork, "Studien zum Mitani," *AOF*, VIII (1932/33), 308-14.

³⁴ Forrer, "Die acht Sprachen der Boghazköi-Inschriften," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1919, pp. 1032-34, and "Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hatti-Reiches," *ZDMG*, LXXVI (1922), 228-41; Bleichsteiner, "Zum Protochattischen," *Berichte des Forschungs-Institutes für Osten und Orient*, III (Wien, 1923), 102-6.

and the later Lycians³⁵ and Lydians;³⁶ possibly also by the Etruscans in Italy.³⁷ Such analogues as may be found between Elamite and any of these other languages naturally point only to linguistic affinities and not to a linguistic unity; with due caution, however, they may indicate ethnic relationships.

For a modern anthropologist it is difficult, if not impossible, to imagine that the present-day inhabitants of Iran could make up a single ethnological family. From time immemorial the plateau has been subjected to invasion and counter-invasion, for, in spite of the difficulties its borders present, it must be remembered that Iran is as much a bridge between the Far East and the Land of the Two Rivers as is Palestine between Asia and Africa. Consequently, peoples of highly diverse origin have sheltered themselves under a single linguistic roof in Iran; and the

³⁵ Kluge, "Die lykischen Inschriften," *MVAG*, XV, Heft 1 (1910), 1-135; Bork, *Skizze des Lükischen* (Königsberg i. Pr., 1926); Deeters, "Lykia. VII. Sprache," Pauly-Wissowa, *Real Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, XXVI (1927), 2282-91; P. Meriggi, "Über einige lykische Pronominal- und Verbalformen," *Indogermanische Forschungen*, XLVI (1928), 151-82, and "Beiträge zur lykischen Syntax," *Kleinasiatische Forschungen*, I, Heft 3 (1930), 414-61.

³⁶ Deeters, "Lydia. Sprache und Schrift," Pauly-Wissowa, *op. cit.*, XXVI (1927), 2153-61; W. Brandenstein, "Die lydische Sprache," *WZKM*, XXXVI (1929), 263-304, and XXXVIII (1932), 1-67; "Die Nominalformen des Lydischen," *Caucasica*, IX (1931), 25-40; "Die lydische Nominalflexion," *ibid.*, X (1932), 67-94.

³⁷ G. Herbig, "Etrusker. B. Sprache," *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, III (1925), 138-47; cf. F. Sommer, "Das lydische und etruskische F-Zeichen," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Abt., 1930, Heft 1, pp. 1-23.

southern part of the land today, as it must have been in ancient times, is pronouncedly piebald in an ethnic sense.

The paucity of archeological and anthropological data has given rise to innumerable speculations concerning the people who dwelt in Iran at the dawn of written history. Some of these are based on philology alone—a dangerous and often misleading guide. Others are derived from cultural features and frequently disregard the effects of borrowing by peoples on the outer fringes of a cultural area, or the changes resulting when new immigrants adopt the cultural advances of indigenous populations. The best we can hope is to avoid the more obvious pitfalls while we state what appear to be the ascertainable facts.

Physical anthropologists are certain that Mesopotamia was the eastern borderline for Semitic types of individuals and that the Semites, whom we know as the brown Mediterranean peoples who invaded Mesopotamia from Arabia, did not inhabit Iran at an early date. When, therefore, the author of the tenth chapter of Genesis calls Elam a son of Shem, that is, a Semite, he is speaking not in anthropological but in geographical and cultural terms. Nor did Nordic peoples speaking an Indo-Iranian language dwell in Iran in early times; the earliest evidence indicating their entry is dated to the beginning of the second millennium B.C. and is based on the mention of Indo-Iranian deities among Kassite gods.

There is some evidence leading to the belief that a protonegroid population once extended westward from India along the shores of the Persian Gulf. Individuals of that group seem to be portrayed on seventh century B.C. reliefs of an Assyrian king.³⁸ Greek authors speak of "Ethiopians" in the southeast of the land;³⁹ their modern descendants possess copper skins, straight hair, and round skulls.⁴⁰ It is, however, safe to say that these peoples never constituted an important or a large element in the population.

So far as it is possible to determine, in ancient times there were longheaded races in Iran preceding the Nordic peoples. The basis for this belief is found in the appearance, in Mesopotamia, of a brown Euraffrican type of man. Our present evidence concerning him is indeed scanty, but seems to suggest a remote physical connection with India.⁴¹ It is possible that these longheads themselves were Sumerians, or were related to them, for it has been said that one can still

³⁸ Cf. the upper register of the Ashurbanipal relief in E. Pottier, *Les Antiquités assyriennes* (du Musée du Louvre) (Paris, 1917), Pl. 23; for details cf. Victor Place, *Ninive et l'Assyrie*, Vol. III (Paris, 1867), Pl. 59, No. 1. Or see H. R. Hall, *Babylonian and Assyrian Sculpture in the British Museum* (Paris and Brussels, 1928), Pl. XLIV. Finally, cf. the Achaemenian reliefs from Susa in M. Dieulafoy, *L'acropole de Suse* (Paris, 1893), Pls. V and VI.

³⁹ Herodotus vii. 70; Strabo xv, 1, 13, and 24.

⁴⁰ Dieulafoy, *L'acropole de Suse*, p. 28.

⁴¹ Buxton in L. H. Dudley Buxton and D. Talbot Rice, "Report on the Human Remains Found at Kish," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, LXI (1931), 57-119, esp. pp. 84 ff.

trace the ancient Sumerian face eastward among the peoples of Afghanistan and Baluchistan, even to the valley of the Indus.⁴²

The most important element, however, appears to have been roundheaded. In the present population of the plateau, at least in the eastern portion, there is a very striking group of roundheads, who are more numerous in the uplands than on the plain.⁴³ Some may be related to the Dravidians of India, in particular to the Tamil-speaking peoples, among whom there is a marked brachycephalic element.⁴⁴ The stature of others is often rather tall, with frequently a marked correlation between this stature and fairness of skin. Such features might argue for an admixture with Nordics; but recalling the fairness of some European Alpines, we might also conjecture that these present-day peoples are the remnant of a proto-Alpine race. If the daring suggestion⁴⁵ that the so-called "Armenoids" originated in Turkestan be accepted, the hypothesis that the early inhabitants of Iran were primarily of this stock would be strengthened. Philol-

⁴² Sir Arthur Keith in Hall and Woolley, *Al-Ubaid* ("Ur Excavations," Vol. I [Oxford, 1927]), p. 216. On this question cf. H. Frankfort, *Archeology and the Sumerian Problem* (*SAOC*, No. 4), pp. 40-47.

⁴³ Cf. Buxton, *The Peoples of Asia* (New York, 1925), pp. 112 f.; W. Z. Ripley, *The Races of Europe* (New York, 1919), pp. 450 f.; R. B. Dixon, *The Racial History of Man* (New York, 1923), pp. 309-12.

⁴⁴ Cf. Dixon, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

⁴⁵ G. Elliot Smith, *Human History* (London, 1930), pp. 167 f., and *The Ancient Egyptians* (new and rev. ed.; London, 1923), pp. 102-5; Buxton, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-13.

ogy, dangerous as its evidence may be, concurs with this "Alpine" theory and tentatively suggests that the extension of "Caucasian" linguistic elements from far-away India on the east through Elam and the Zagros into Anatolia on the west is perhaps not without significance.

Nevertheless, this view conflicts with the theory already stated and commonly held, that the brown Eurafrican variety of longheads in Mesopotamia was also the chief block of the earliest population in Iran. If this be accepted, we must assume, as indeed would not be difficult, that the "Caucasian" linguistic affinities have transcended race and people, being spoken both by the *supposed* original roundheads of Asia Minor and by the dolichocephalic peoples of Iran.

The present state of our knowledge leaves us at a complete stalemate. No theory, enticing as it may be, is acceptable; only with the help of physical anthropology shall we solve the problem.

Where we possess written records the social customs are much less difficult to describe. Such documentation for Iran is found only in Elam and only after the twenty-fifth century B.C.; even then we must read between the lines of a few inscriptions to obtain the maximum amount of evidence.

In Elam, as elsewhere throughout the Orient in early times, woman's sphere of activity was not limited to the home. Like man, she signed documents, carried on business, inherited and willed

fortunes, brought suits in the law courts, and owned slaves. Her importance increased with the passing years. In early Elamite documents we notice the frequent mention of the ruler's mother, sister, or daughter. The available evidence in the so-called "classical" period points to the matrilinear character of the royal succession; that is, right to the throne was traceable through the mother. Instances of brother-sister marriages occur, and presumably this was a general practice. It is even possible that this type of marriage practiced by Achaemenian Persian kings should be traced back to an Elamite origin, for to Aryan minds union of full brother and sister was repulsive.

Peculiarities of the Elamite royal succession will be pointed out from time to time as they occur. Particularly noteworthy is a curious system by which a prince in a relatively minor position could advance step by step to one of great importance, sometimes even to sovereignty. On other occasions the kingship descended, not from father to son, but from brother to brother. In many parts of the ancient East the kings were considered as gods; in Elam not the king alone but the entire ruling family was deified.

Elamite religion was naturally polytheistic in character. Unfortunately, some of the divine names were written only by means of the Akkadian ideograms. This does not mean that the name of the sun-god, Shamash in Semitic, for example, was so pronounced

in Elam; there his name had doubtless a wholly different pronunciation, perhaps Nahhunte. Two deities were all-important in the royal and official literature: Huban and Inshushinak. The name of the former was often written by means of the Akkadian ideogram which proclaimed him "the Great One." Inshushinak was, quite literally, "the Lord of Susa."⁴⁶ Nevertheless, although the rulers might proclaim the supremacy of these gods, many passages referring to Kiririsha, a form of the mother-goddess, and hundreds of clay statuettes of this deity found in the course of the Susa excavations, bespeak her whom the common people of Elam really and sincerely worshiped.

Thus briefly we may conclude our survey of the land and its prehistory, language, and people. Restrictions of time and space will prevent the presentation in the following pages of many subjects which are largely cultural in aspect. Much that follows will be concerned with names, dates, and synchronisms with Babylonian events, for this study is primarily a political history. Even thus limited, a history is not without value, for to comprehend fully the contributions of early man in Iran and in Elam we must first understand his relationship to his immediate neighbors. For that purpose a political history is essential.

⁴⁶ The Elamite name form Inshushinak (also spelled Insushnak and Inshushnak) developed from the Sumerian name Nin-shushin-ak. The Akkadian form is Shushinak. Cf. Poebel in *AJSL*, XLIX (1932/33), 136, and LI (1934/35), 171.

